MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION
SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M

ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

1172

2001 HOUSE EDUCATION

HB 1172

2001 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB1172

House Education Committee

❑ Conference Committee

Hearing Date 01/16/01

Tape Number	Side A	Side B	Meter #
#1		X	13-5890
Committee Clerk Signature			

Minutes:

Chairman R. Kelsch, Vice-Chair T. Brusegaard, Rep. Bellew, Rep. Grumbo, Rep. Haas, Rep. Hanson, Rep. Hawken, Rep. Hunskor, Rep. Johnson, Rep. Meier, Rep. Mueller, Rep. Nelson, Rep. Nottestad, Rep. Solberg, Rep. Thoreson

Chairman Kelsch: We will open the hearing on HB1172

Greg Gallagher: (Education Improvement Team Leader within the DPI) Please refer to the attached testimony.

Vice-Chairman Brusegaard: Passing this legislation would allow DPI to widen these charter school funds, and then hope schools, if they wanted to become an innovative school would apply to DPI for a test?

Gallagher: Yes, it simply allows for the opportunity for us to submit for the federal funds. If we were to receive those funds, the application exists between the district and the state.

Vice-Chairman Brusegaard: So the districts wouldn't be directly requesting grants from the federal government?

Gallagher: They would be directly applying for the grant to the state. If treated as a sub-grant, the federal governments for the state the privilege to grant to districts based on the quality of those proposals.

Vice-Chairman Brusegaard: So then the entity that would actually award the grants from DPI would be that seven member committee.

Gallagher: Correct. The way that the legislation is proposed is that the committee would review and then author a recommendation to the state superintendent, but essentially it's the committee itself that would do the review.

Rep. Mueller: Do we have some school districts, school systems in the state that indicated that they would like to do something like this?

Gallagher: Specifically related to the charter schools, no. The reason we put this forward is that as we see the development of a good system of education in the state, it offered the opportunity for those to do so. We have different sites across the state which are doing innovative work, and we've identified it more anecdotally then anything.

Rep. Thoreson: I think we do have an awful lot of seat time in the public schools system, and if we can find some way to make some more progressive, positive ways to change that, I think that would be really good. In this plan, is this for small schools, large schools and do they have to change something that affects the whole school or just a portion of the school?

Gallagher: If need not be a district, it could be a school. If need not be a school, it could be a programmatic approach. There are a variety of definitions as to how this could occur. The way

it's worded, it's very specific. Funds could be available for schools within schools, or in a multi-school district. It opens the door for districts to seek additional funding that they don't have right now.

Rep. Haas: If the federal stream stops after three years, isn't that going to leave the school in somewhat of a predicament?

Gallagher: As we see it, no worse than where they would be currently. Nothing changes in terms of structuring.

Rep. Haas: Are you saying that you would see, if the school got a $80,000 grant for three years, are you saying that you see that funding being used for nonrecurring expenses in order to simply establish the initiative?

Gallagher: One option would be, they would dedicate those $80,000 for three years to nothing but the type of planning that they would want to do. Professional development, for example, would be a primary part, which some districts, it costs the country. I could only guess that for a review committee that saw a plan with extensive capital improvements, they would stick to it. The planning is critical and they are held to that plan. Without giving it a lot of limitations, it can be used any way it will. If it's used unwisely, most likely it won't be accepted.

Rep. Hunskor: Neighboring states, has research been done into, do they have charter schools there, how successful have they been, and also could you give us an example, within a charter school, some innovative program?

Gallagher: There are 35 states across the country that have charter legislation. All but 2 have actually exercised that right. Of the states that have been done, an Idaho comes close to what we'd be talking about here. The structure of the law is the same. The study that has been done

has been dedicated primarily to what has made charter schools succeed the best, and it's been dedicated to the type of research on what makes a good plan. Across the country it's scattered, there's no one insight, we have some places where charter schools have not performed very well. Arizona, for example, you have a wide open application process, where corporations can support the plan. In ND, it's limited to the local district. Within those settings, where corporations are, your accountability is a little more soft, but the research isn't very good right now, in terms of what we're going to learn from it. Our approach is a well maintained one, it's measured.

Rep. Hunskor: So, each school, then would come up with its own plan, subject to approval?

Gallagher: That is correct.

Rep. Hawken: The current waiver board is pretty nonpolitical, and it's doing relatively well, is there a reason for making it larger, and adding expenses and that kind of thing?

Gallagher: The additional cost is absolutely minimal. The reason for the expanding of the board is to say that when we're moving into waivers, that the accountability element sometimes does require broader audience. As you're saying, the current one is seen as nonpolitical at this point. If you take a look at it from another perspective, the current structure of the board is from within the education community center itself. We've got the NDEA, school leaders, the school board association. Now that is elected officials, but within ND, ND authority ultimately comes from the legislature in matters of education, so it's giving a nod to the constitutional connections within the state. It is not conducted solely by teachers, administrators or school boards, it is conducted also because of what the legislature sets forth. And also the governor and the state superintendent, within their respective constitutional roles impact what happens, it appears appropriate to us to broaden the levels of discussion itself.

Tony Weiler: (on behalf of the State Association of Non-Public Schools) Please refer to attached testimony.

Chairman Kelsch: Anyone who wishes to appear in opposition to HB1172

Larry Klundt: (ExecutiveDirector of the ND Council of Education Leaders) Interested in the necessity of this bill. Currently, there is a law that allows the state superintendent to waive conditions for accreditation, and I think even statute maybe. If a three member committee made up of the people that you heard about concur that it ought to happen, I guess the question I have is, if that already exists, why do we need another bill to allow that to happen. If a school district really wants to create an innovative project of some sort, that is, fact predicated on the concepts of content standards and aligning curriculum and having assessments that are connected with accountability. They can apply for a waiver to go ahead. The piece that's missing, I suppose is the carrot, which is the $1.5 million. Now that might come from the feds. I don't know if there's a guarantee that it will come, because nowhere in the bill do I see the words 'charter school' and maybe the feds need to have that. Local school districts can create innovative school districts now. They can design them by themselves, with the elements and requirements that they have established for themselves, not as established by the federal gov't or by the state, so I don't know why we need that. I suspect there would be a fiscal note necessary with this. Currently, when the waiver committee meets, it's at our expense. I suspect if this passes, that's going to turn around. We have had several requests for waivers. None of them have been in the area of what is described as the opportunity for public schools in this bill. One of them was close. I think that maybe there's not a lot of desire at this point. I'm not sure that there's a sense of urgency and importance associated with the language that's in this bill among public schools at this point and

maybe there should be, but I don't sense that. I suspect that as soon as you deal with another bill that's coming along with content standards and performance and assessments and accountability to satisfy the federal government's need relative to the Title I money that you're going to be talking about. All of a sudden, this bill doesn't become innovative anymore, because it's going to be a requirement that those kind of things be in place.

Rep. Hawken: Why would we not want it? I heard what you said, but if it does open up an avenue for additional funding that might lead to some creative wonderful things, is there something specific that would make this bad?

Klundt: Not necessarily, if $1.5 million is enough motivation, enough to create that desire to get the Fargo public schools to create charters around the city.

Max Laird: (NDEA) Please refer to attached testimony.

William Schuh: Please refer to attached testimony

Bev Nielson: (ND School Board's Association) Right now we have a waiver committee that deals with and has historically dealt with fairly narrow waivers for one particular thing. In Fargo, they asked for a teacher type of waiver for their ESL classes, and they showed why that would be more beneficial to kids who spoke that language to have someone who spoke that language. And this committee dealt with that, and it didn't require that they had adopted state standards and that type of thing, it was just evaluated on the basis of what benefit would come to the children by obtaining the waiver. One concern I have is if we go to the comprehensive waiver, which requires state standards in a much more comprehensive nature, what happens to those districts who don't care if they get federal funds, they just want to make their case for a waiver of a certain credential or regulatory requirement based on what types of student performance they

believe they could provide in a better way by having that way. One of our concerns that that options not go away for schools, and that in order to get that one thing, you don't have to adopt an entire curricular-wise state standard. In relation to the committee, and as I work through how we get to where we get with education and the types of inputs that we have and the types of regulations that we have, as I walk through it, when you look at a bill like this, that the legislature over the course of three months, every two years, develops policies which is put into law as to how they would like the educational system to run. Those bills are either passed or vetoed by the governor, and at that point, local school boards and administrators and teachers are given the authority to carry this out. I can't help but have a little problem imagining the three political appointees, on a committee like this, not sort of extending their session idea on out into forever. I guess I don't really understand the necessity for that representation. This committee is way down the line from where the rules have already been promulgated and it seems to me at that point, to have those who are in the education community to meet and discuss the waivers based on the guidelines that have been set up by the legislature, the governor and DPI.

Rep. Mueller: Can we bring back one of the testifiers?

Rep. Mueller: Can we do what you're suggesting with the current law?

Gallagher: Our recommendation is to keep the current waiver option as it is in 15.1-06-08. That would stay on the books for those districts that would want to use the current approach to a waiver. This proposal is to add to that, a second option as far as seeking a waiver. An option that would work for those districts that are looking for a more expansive, planned approach and that would open the door for them.

Rep. Mueller: You're saying, then 'no, we couldn't access those funds with current law.

Gallagher: That is correct.

Rep. Mueller: Do you have any concept of what a fiscal note might be?

Gallagher: The fiscal note would be in the manner of what it would cost to bring in a committee of seven, a couple times a year to do a review. Probably in the area of a couple thousand dollars. There is not an intent to ask any additional state appropriations for this at all. The wording in the text of the bill, is that if ever the state were to move toward the direction of granting awards to schools for progress, then that would be perfectly appropriate to receive that. That's left to the discretion of the legislature if it chooses to do so, therefore, there is no fiscal note.

Chairman Kelsch: It was mentioned that there are 35 states that have some type of innovative school language on their book. Now, out of those 35 states, there are only a couple of them that have actually implemented those programs and are actually utilizing the legislation?

Gallagher: The exact opposite. We have only about 2 that have not exercised their right. Most of the states, in fact, that do have a charter status law, have access charter funds. We currently have about 2000 or 3000 charter schools across the nation. It's not a widely exercised opportunity.

Chairman Kelsch: Their DPI would request those funds and receive those funds, and what happens if schools do not access those funds? Where does it goes?

Gallagher: They stay with the US Dept. Of Edu. When a state puts forth an application, it would do so based on the number of the expected applicants it would receive during that funding period. What generally happens is that, in December of the year, the US Dept. Of Edu will announce the federal register a three to four month application period for states to put forth their

proposal on what they're seeking for funding. It goes through a review process and is funded accordingly. Across the country $90 million are set aside every year for charter schools.

Chairman Kelsch: We'll close the hearing on HB1172.

2001 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB 1172 B

House Education Committee

☐ Conference Committee

Hearing Date 1/31/01

Tape Number	Side A	Side B	Meter #
1	X		831-1065

Committee Clerk Signature Robin L. Small

Minutes:

REP. R KELSCH called the committee to order, all members were present except REP. SOLBERG.

ACTION:

REP. THORESON motioned for a DO NOT PASS, seconded by REP. MUELLER. Committee discussion. Seeing none the clerk calls the roll. 14 YES, 0 NO and 1 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING. The motion carries. The CARRIER of the bill is REP. BRUSEGAARD.

HB 1172: DO NOT PASS 14-0

CARRIER: REP. BRUSEGAARD

Date: 1/31/01
Roll Call Vote #: 1

2001 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. HB1172

House House Education Committee

☐ Subcommittee on _____

or

☐ Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number _____

Action Taken Do Not Pass

Motion Made By Rep. Thoreson Seconded By Rep. Mueller

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman-RaeAnn G. Kelsch	✓		Rep. Howard Grumbo	✓	
V. Chairman-Thomas T. Brusegaard	✓		Rep. Lyle Hanson	✓	
Rep. Larry Bellew	✓		Rep. Bob Hunskor	✓	
Rep. C.B. Haas	✓		Rep. Phillip Mueller	✓	
Rep. Kathy Hawken	✓		Rep. Dorvan Solberg		
Rep. Dennis E. Johnson	✓				
Rep. Lisa Meier	✓				
Rep. Jon O. Nelson	✓				
Rep.Darrell D. Nottestad	✓				
Rep. Laurel Thoreson	✓				

Total (Yes) 14 No 0

Absent 1

Floor Assignment Rep. Brusegaard

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

HB 1172: Education Committee (Rep. R. Kelsch, Chairman) recommends **DO NOT PASS** (14 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 1 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1172 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.

2001 TESTIMONY

HB 1172

TESTIMONY ON HB 1172
HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
January 16, 2001

By Greg Gallagher, Education Improvement Team Leader
Department of Public Instruction
328-1838

Madam Chairperson and Members of the House Education Committee:

I am Greg Gallagher, Education Improvement Team Leader within the Department of Public Instruction. I am here to speak in favor of HB 1172 and to present an overview of the comprehensive waiver proposal.

The Department has identified four principles that should guide the development of any meaningful education improvement and that should form the basis for effective accountability:

(1) *All students should be taught to challenging standards;*

(2) *All students' performance should be measured against these standards;*

(3) *All schools should be accountable for their students' performance levels;*

(4) *All schools should be afforded optimum flexibility to achieve these aims.*

HB 1172 addresses these four principles.

HB 1172 provides for the creation of a new section in NDCC that would expand the state's current waiver law (NDCC 15.1-06), thereby allowing for the establishment of locally defined innovative schools. An innovative school is any public school setting that accomplishes its educational mission in a manner that may not be compatible with the restrictions of current law. HB 1172 offers a means for local districts to waive any statutes or rules, except those relating to health, safety, and civil rights, for the purpose of creating a unique school setting and implementing innovative practices. In return for receiving the privilege to waive statutes and rules, local districts commit themselves to achieving improved student performance levels.

Under current statute and rules, quality education is defined in terms of inputs and capacity: e.g., classes defined in terms of seat time requirements, curriculum defined in terms of categorical units, staffing defined in terms of student per staff ratios, and more. Districts are accountable for meeting certain input and capacity levels. Student

performance levels are not considered. Under HB 1172 districts shift their accountability from a focus on performing activities (e.g., a student who is required to be in a class for 40 minutes a day for 180 days a year) to a commitment to achieving results (e.g., a student who can perform to proficiency). Districts are responsible for achieving student proficiency in terms of challenging standards. Districts, in turn, are granted optimal flexibility to achieve this goal.

HB 1172 protects the state's overriding responsibility to assure a uniform system of education and implied literacy levels. To accomplish this balance, HB 1172 incorporates the following measures.

1. Districts submit a plan detailing what is being waived, what is being developed, governance arrangements, community involvement efforts, and accountability measures. Districts pursue *their* priorities, develop *their* plans and submit *their* applications.
2. A seven-member committee reviews waiver applications based on quality criteria and forwards recommendations to the State Superintendent. The State Superintendent issues any waiver and awards an innovative site status.
3. An innovative site status lasts up to three years and may be renewed.
4. To allow for a manageable transition into this initiative, the State Superintendent may limit the total number of innovation awards to 20 sites.

HB 1172 offers substantial improvements over the state's current waiver law. The current law is vague and offers no guidance on application or selection criteria. HB 1172 clearly defines the components of good planning, the elements of an application, and the criteria for selection. Research indicates that districts who conduct thorough planning will more likely experience improved results than those who do not plan well.

HB 1172 allows for more comprehensive innovations than does current law. Systemic innovations offer the best opportunities for making progress to improve teaching and learning; however, such innovations require safeguards to protect the consumer. The combination of good planning and a clearly stated accountability provision in HB 1172 offer assurances to citizens that any innovations will result in improved performance. The state's responsibility to secure literacy is maintained. Current law does not seek such an assurance.

HB 1172 opens the possibility for the state to apply for and receive competitive federal charter school funds. Congress established the charter school fund to encourage states and localities to seek innovations in education. To be eligible for accessing charter school funds, states must enact legislation that allows districts to seek a release from legal restrictions in return for performance-based accountability. We believe HB 1172 meets the requirements of federal charter school rules; our current law does not. It is important to note, however, that if a district were to seek a comprehensive waiver under HB 1172 *they would be entirely free to access or ignore the option of federal charter school funding.* With the enactment of HB 1172, the Department of Public Instruction would apply for competitive federal charter school funds to make them available to eligible local districts. Competitive charter school funds could amount to between $50,000 and $80,000 per year per site for a three-year startup cycle. The total state allocation could run approximately $1,500,000 per year, depending on need. HB 1172 is North Dakota's charter school legislation, *unique unto ourselves and reflective of our governance model.*

How might HB 1172 be used? The comprehensive innovation waiver is simply a *voluntary* tool to improve education, it is not an innovation program in itself. How it is used is left entirely to local districts to decide. Whether a district might completely restructure their curriculum, adjust their class period structure, introduce a specialized instructional field, or expand their approach to support services rests entirely on their ability to plan, implement, and achieve success according to *their* vision. The comprehensive waiver simply offers a means for such visions to find expression.

The state constitution places responsibility on the legislative assembly to provide for a uniform system of education statewide. The legislative assembly, in turn, holds local districts accountable for the delivery of educational services within the bounds of the law. HB 1172 honors the legislative assembly's responsibility to assure a uniform system based on four foundational principles: (1) teaching to challenging standards; (2) student performance against these standards; (3) district accountability for student performance; and (4) flexibility to local districts to perform these goals. This fourth principle of flexibility is critical if true innovation is to flourish within our schools. If the state is clear about what is expected of its districts and schools regarding student performance, then every appropriate effort should be made to free districts and schools

voluntarily from those obstacles that may impede them from achieving beneficial innovations.

The Department of Public Instruction believes that HB 1172 has the potential to be among the more important education opportunities to be afforded local districts in the state's history. It is rooted in the state's current waiver law, grounded on clear educational principles, and supported by evidence of success in the real world. The Department endorses HB 1172 and any legislation that accomplishes the aims of these principles. HB 1172 is a good bill and sound policy. The Department respectfully requests your approval of HB 1172.

Madam Chairperson, this completes my testimony. I am pleased to answer any questions from members of the Education Committee. Thank you.

January 16, 2001

HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
HB 1172

MADAM CHAIR KELSCH AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

My name is Tony Weiler. I am appearing today on behalf of the State Association of Non-Public Schools (SANS). We support this bill, but ask that you amend the bill so that non-public schools are also allowed this waiver.

While non-public schools are not bound by many state regulations since they do not receive public funding, nevertheless, they must meet the same rules and regulations for accreditation as public schools. It only makes sense, therefore, that if the state is going to waive these rules for public schools, they should also waive them for non-public schools so that they also could seek innovative school status.

Non-public schools would like to be included in this legislation to give our schools an opportunity to create an innovative school, should that school so choose.

Our proposed amendments simply allow the non-public schools an opportunity to implement this new legislation without including them in the language regarding funding.

If you have any questions, I will be happy to try to answer them. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CONSIDERATION.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1172

Page 1, line 11, after the second word "district," insert "nonpublic schools,"

Page 1, line 16, after "school" insert ", except for an innovative nonpublic school,"

Page 2, line 1, after "district" insert ", nonpublic school"

Page 2, line 15, after "district" insert ", nonpublic school"

Page 2, line 18, after "district" insert ", nonpublic school"

Page 3, line 19, after "association," insert "one member appointed by the State Association of Nonpublic Schools,"

Renumber accordingly

Testimony on HB1172

Max Laird...NDEA

As written this legislation changes a number or things about the present law that have yet not proven to have fault. The present scenario allows those who represent a statewide perspective on school issues to work with the Supt. of Public Instruction to allow for innovative programs to be field tested. The new language expands all facets of the present law and could result in slowed decision making and the addition of outside issues to the process. To date we have not experienced any conflict or difficulty in making decision about whether or not schools should be able to receive a waiver.

We are unaware of any changes in federal or state law that would necessitate this kind of change to a small low cost program that continues to work as it was designed.

15-21-04.5 Waiver of conditions for accreditation and approval. The superintendent of public instruction may waive any conditions for accreditation and approval imposed by statute for a reasonable length of time, provided the waiver encourages innovation or permits experimentation and provided the plans and purposes document the potential for an improved program. The superintendent may waive the conditions only upon the concurrence of a majority of a waiver committee composed of one person appointed by the North Dakota education association, one person appointed by the North Dakota council of school administrators, and one person appointed by the North Dakota school boards association.

Written Testimony Presented to the House Education Committee

(of the 57th Legislative Assembly / on January 16th, 2001)

Concerning House Bill 1172

by

William M. Schuh

Chairman Kelsh and honorable members of the House Education Committee. I ask you to vote **do not pass on House Bill 1172.** HB 1172 enacts a large transfer of power, wherein virtually all legislative control of education, all laws enacted by the legislature, and all rules and regulations approved by the legislature in all previous and all future sessions, are placed at the discretion, and in the hands of a committee of seven. House Bill 1172 places large powers, effecting too many children, in the hands of too few, with too little public control and oversight. House Bill 1172 is virtually identical to a Senate Bill numbered 2175 in the previous legislative session, which failed recommendation by the Senate Education Committee by a unanimous vote. It differs only in a change of composition of the proposed waiver committee, which now has representatives of the governor's office and the legislature, and in the now unrestricted number of candidate schools.

(1) HB 1172 is intended to enable large changes, on a whole-district and whole-school scale, in a manner contrary to current laws, rules and regulations as directed by the legislature. This is the stated and only purpose of this bill: to promote changes contrary to state law, rule, and regulation, on a large scale.

(2) HB 1172 is not necessary to protect a reasonable level of careful experimentation. There is no current law prohibiting a teacher or district from experimenting in the classroom, as long as they do not violate the rather broad boundaries of state law, which basically ensure a minimal number of school days, a minimal number of courses in basic areas, objective grading standards, and limitations on the invasion of the privacy and the affective domains of the student's life. Within these frameworks, educators can experiment now. HB 1172 is not even needed to achieve a limited waiver from current legal restrictions. These are allowed under current provisions of *15-21-04.5.*

(3) There is a difference between being innovative, and promoting innovationism, wherein constant and destabilizing changes are sought for their own sake, to the detriment of the students. While some experiments lead to beneficial results, most fail, and even successful experiments are seldom wholly successful. History is full of educational experiments, the Summerhill school, the open school, the new math, that left many students with gaps in their education. Experimentation and innovation should be done slowly and carefully. Some current fads include (i) an imbalanced and excessive use of group learning strategies, to the detriment of individual incentive and initiative, under the name of cooperative learning; (ii) group grading schemes which destroy individual incentive for students; (iii) attempts to do away with objective grading standards, and use subjectively oriented portfolios, (iv) ignoring the teaching of computational skills (adding, subtracting, multiplying, dividing), on the belief that these will be unnecessary in the computer age; (v) greater movement of schools into the personal, emotional, and affective lives of the students which belong under the supervision of parents; and many others. Experiments in these areas have already been tried in many schools. They have seldom succeeded. HB 1172 will remove safeguards against tendencies toward excessive and destabilizing experimentation with the lives and educations of our children.

(4) What kind of changes can we expect that are contrary to current law? The field of potential experiments is wide open. Some examples are: current laws prohibiting schools from distributing contraceptives; current laws requiring a prescribed length for the school year; and current laws requiring that in school-to-work programs students must be over sixteen years of age to be placed in the work place. Any of these, and many others as well could be suspended in "innovative education sites". Is this what proponents have in mind? I can't say. But even if today's proposed programs are reasonable, will tomorrow's remain that way?

(5) There is an evident intention to obtain special funding available to these schools and not to others, as referenced by the statement that "a designated innovative school in good standing is eligible to apply for any dedicated allocation appropriated by the legislative assembly in addition to the usual state funding". (1)

(6) The scale of HB 1172 (no restrictions) *(5)* is large. This is not a slow and carefully considered process. The sheer number of potential schools, districts, and students involved argues against this bill.

(7) HB 1172 is not voluntary at all for the parents and children who do not want to be part of an educational experiment. Provisions for parental or community " input " *(2e)* do not protect unwilling subjects from being forced into these "innovational settings". It might be excusable for a private school to undertake these kinds of experiments with willing and paying people. But no one should be forced to place their children into a public school that may subject them to unproven or potentially controversial educational practices, or otherwise jeopardize their education. Children have a right to proven, and stable educational environment.

(8) If passed, HB 1172 will render all legislative action and control of education, past, present, and future, to be selectively ineffective, as long as it is in effect. It will subject restraints and controls on educational practices imposed by citizens through their legislature, to the approval of educational officials, rather than vice versa. It will constitute a large erosion of legislative power over education.

In Conclusion

House Bill 1172 will diminish effective legislative power and authority over education, it will encourage excessive experimentation at the expense of sound educational practices, it will potentially remove too many children in too many districts from the protection law and rule, and it will do so for many against the will of their parents. This bill places large powers, effecting too many children, in the hands of too few, with too little public control and oversight.

I ask you to vote do not pass on House Bill 1172

Thank you for your Consideration